

since the unsaturation necessary for oxidative drying is no longer present due to UV reactive acrylic functionalities. Further, Boeckeler teaches at col. 1, lines 56-59 that the thiol functionalities should be reacted with pendant allylic groups. It would not be obvious to select resins without such functionalities. For at least these reasons, the rejected claims are not obvious in view of Boeckeler.

Claims 1-5, 7, 8, 11-15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Boeckeler in view of Ostlie (5,876,805). However, Ostlie fails to remedy the deficiencies noted in Boeckeler above. The rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 1-5, 7, 8, 11-15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over GB 2 166 749 (GB749) in view of Ostlie. As discussed in previous communications, GB749 does not mention photoinitiators. Ostlie is cited in an attempt to overcome this omission. However, GB749 discloses Michael reactions, which are nucleophilic, non-radical reactions and cannot be initiated by UV. Adding a photoinitiator to GB749 would make no sense and have no effect. Thus, at least for this reason, the cited claims are non-obvious over GB749 in view of Ostlie.

Claims 6 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over Boeckler or GB 2 166 749 in view of Ostlie and further in view of Doomen et al (5,859,135). The rejection is respectfully traversed. The deficiencies of Boeckeler and the unsupportable attempt to combine Ostlie and GB749 are not cured by Doomen et al. At least for this reason, claim 6 is non-obvious over the cited references.


Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as obvious over Boeckeler or GB 2 166 749 in view of Ostlie, further in view of Moyer et al (4,078,118). The rejection is respectfully traversed. The deficiencies of Boeckeler and the unsupportable attempt to combine Ostlie and GB749 are not cured by Moyer et al. At least for this reason, claim 9 is non-obvious over the cited references.

Claims 1-9 and claims 11-17 are rejected under the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-13 of US Patent No. 6,476,183 in view of Boeckeler or Ostlie. According to the office action, Boeckeler or Ostlie would make it obvious to add a photoinitiator to the composition of US183. However, as discussed above, Boeckeler is directed to thiol – allylic reactions and does not disclose the UV promoted thiol curing of the polycondensation products of the presently claimed

composition. It is not obvious to use a thio-allylic promoting photoinitiator for curing non-allylic alkyds with thiols. Ostlie is directed polymerizing vinyl monomers or oligomers using polythiols and a daylight photoinitiator. US183 teaches compositions with long shelf life. Consequently, there would be no motivation to add to the siccative-containing compositions of US183 a photoinitiator which would promote rapid cure (30 seconds according to col. 7, lines 9 – 12 of Ostlie). At least for these reasons, withdrawal of the rejection for obviousness double patenting is respectfully requested.

Thus, as discussed above, the present claims are allowable over the cited art. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



David H. Vickrey
Reg. No. 30,697
Attorney for Applicant

Akzo Nobel Inc.
Intellectual Property Dept.
7 Livingstone Avenue
Dobbs Ferry, NY 10522-3408
(914) 674-5459